1 Jeffrey W. Tam 2 408 Yorkshire Road 3 Alameda, Ca 94501

4 5 6

7

9

10

Date: July 9, 2008

JEFFREY W. TAM

Plaintiff

Defendant

V.

8 To: Clerk, United States District Court 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36060

San Francisco, California 94102



NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14 15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 JOHN E. POTTER

24 25

26

27

28 29 30

31

37 38

39

40

36

41 42

43

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

No. 07-2747 SI

ORDER DIRECTING SUPPLEMENTAL

BRIEFING

Date: July 9, 2008

- Re: Plaintiff replies / responds to the order directing supplemental briefing. C07-02747 SI
 - 1 On May 28, 2002, Plaintiff submitted the request to return to be a tractor-Trailer operator (TTO) .to Mr. Keith Inouye and to the Union Shop Steward, Mr. Perry. deposition of K Inouye Ex 6. Mr. Inouye suggested to submit the request to the USPS Human Resource manager, Ms. Virginia Clover in July 2002 when there was residual vacancy, deposition of K Inouye Ex 7. The return to be a TTO was granted and the driving training was completed in August 2002. There must be vacant TTO position in order to grant the Plaintiff to receive the driving training, deposition of K Inouve Ex 8.
 - 2 The USPS office prepares the following year bid work sheet around October. Union rectifies the work schedules. The bid sheet for the drivers is available in December. In September 2002, Mr. Reinosa passed away. A vacant position

No. 07-2747 IS

Date: July 9, 2008

was available. More vacant TTO positions must be available in year 2002 because the year 2003 TTO bid sheet had 12 residual positions available. From the month of Mr. Reinosa's death to the month of the year 2003 bid sheet preparation month, it was only about 2 months apart in October 2002. There were 12 vacant TTO positions on the year 2003 TTO bid sheet. Obviously, those vacant positions could not be appeared all at once between September and November 2002. Therefore, there were TTO vacant positions through out the year 2002.

3 Plaintiff did not request for the document production to answer if the TTO positions vacant in May 2002 were awarded to the part-time drivers.

4 The year 2005 TTO bid sheet had 6 vacant position for Tour 1. The Tour 2 & 3 bid sheets were not provided by the defendant to show those vacant record.

5 Yes, there were TTO vacant position in May 2005 and through out the year from the January 2005 driver bid sheet..

6 Plaintiff did not know if all of the TTO positions vacant in May 2005 were awarded to part-time drivers. In deposition of K Inouye Ex 29, question 11, those four mail handlers and mail carriers from another installation. Gibert Johnson, Guminder Singh, Louis Peralta and Stan Simpson Caucasian were assigned to be part time fixed to MVO. They were in different scenario than the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff is in the same installation to be reassigned. According to the Article 39, Plaintiff should be returning as a full time TTO. In disposition of k Inouye Ex 29, question 12, Steve Castillo, a part time fixed was converted to a full time MVO in November 2005. Plaintiff who had 20 years of driving seniority in the same installation should be promoted in Nov 05. Assumed that the Plaintiff was a part time fixed, but he should not be a part time fixed. The Plaintiff should have more seniority than Castillo. In disposition K Inouye, page 32 line 19 to 24. Mr. Inouye understood the Plaintiff had more seniority than Castillo, yet, Mr. Inouye still promoted Castillo as full time fixed.

7 Yes, the plaintiff's electronic reassignment request was to request for a full time TTO reassignment. Actually, plaintiff did not have to apply the TTO position through the USPS eReassign, but the USPS Management

1 2 3

No. 07-2747 IS

4 5 6

Date: July 9, 2008

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

has asked the plaintiff to submit the eReassign. According to the eReassign, disposition of B Chadha, Ex 8, employee can not submit a reassignment request to their current office in eReassign. When the Plaintiff informed the Management that the e Reassign should not be applied to the plaintiff, the Management requested the plaintiff to take the internal examination, which the Plaintiff had a score of 81, disposition of B Chadha, Ex 10. Plaintiff was then asked to be interviewed for a part time job that the Plaintiff had for the last 26 years. According to the USPS-APWU Joint Contract Interpretation Manual, Article 39.1.B.2 sets the seniority for preferred assignments for motor vehicle employees who leave one position designation for another within the craft and same installation and return to their former position and level. The returning employee would regain the seniority the employee had at the point he/she left the position designation, without credit for time spent in the other position designation and level within 90 days (Article 39.1.B.5.c), retain their seniority, augmented by the time spent in the other position designation and level, provided they remained in the same installation. Article 39.1.B.5.c allows for employees returning to the motor vehicle craft to regain craft seniority.

25 26 27

28

29 30

31

8 Since the plaintiff had submitted the requests to go back driving many, many times due the staging work hours in the clerk position, plaintiff accepted the Union suggestion to go back as a part time fixed TTO. Plaintiff could not take on those bad working hours, which the Management had set up.

36 37

38 39

40 41

42 43

1 CASE NO. 07-02747 SI

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned herby certifies that he is an employee of the United 5 States Postal Services. The undersigned certifies that this reply is 6 served by First Class Mail.

8 To: Clerk, United States District Court 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36060 San Francisco, California 94102

> I declare under penalty of prejury under the laws of the United States that the foregoingis true and correct.

Executed on July 9, 2008 at Alameda, California

Jeffrey W. Tam

408 Yorkshire Road Alameda, Ca 94501